

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY

Council of the Faculty of Arts and Science

Minutes of the meeting held on Friday, May 11, 1990

Present: P. Albert, Chair; M. Yates; B. Harris; P. Regimbald; J. Appleby; D. Dicks; S. Ruby; G. Valaskakis; W. Knitter; H. McQueen; D. Sheps; R. Kilgour; J. Gavin; C. Levy; P. Widden; D. Frost; Z. Hamlet; E. Preston; G. Decarie; R. Perigoe; M. Giguère; W. Byers; A. Planells; C. Potworowski; C. Gray; M. Brian; R. Sharma; H. Shulman; C. White; C. Davis; I. Robinson; D. Shapiro; C. Ragavan; E. Budik; B. Goodman; R. Gossen; B. Leonhardt; H. McLachlan; M. Sullivan.

Regrets: C.L. Bertrand; M. Szabo; H. de Romer; G. Fisher; M. Poirier; J. Drysdale; S. Hoecker-Drysdale.

Absent: P. Kenniff; R. Sheinin; R. Long; W. Gardiner; G. Newsham; G. Trudel; S. Lanthier-O'Connor; J. Browne; B. Cohen; J. Costello; H. Desbarais; R. Dyotte; Y.-L. Khoury; T. Powell; D. Linder; M. Moser; J. Benoit.

Documents considered and distributed at this meeting:

- | | |
|--------------|---|
| ASFC 90-3M-A | Nominations/Ratifications Required for all terms ending May 31, 1990, Council of the Faculty of Arts and Science. |
| ASFC 90-3M-B | Undergraduate Curriculum Course Changes - 1991-92 (Report 67U) |
| ASFC 90-3M-C | Debit Cards for Concordia University Libraries |
| ASFC 90-3M-D | GPA Task Force Report |

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 13:32.

2. Approval of Agenda

90-3-1 It was moved and seconded (Byers/Hamlet) that the agenda be approved.

Dr. Levy questioned a point in the minutes; page 9, Undergraduate Program Evaluation. This was to be on the agenda for this meeting.

Vice-Dean Albert replied that Steering Committee decided that Council must concentrate on the undergraduate curriculum changes at this meeting. Dean Bertrand was away today and he wished to be present for that discussion.

Carried

3. Approval of Minutes of March 16, 1990

90-3-2 It was moved and seconded (Levy/Robinson) that the Minutes of the Meeting of March 16, 1990 be approved.

Prof. Shulman noted that he was present at the meeting of March 16, 1990.

Carried

4. Remarks from the Chair

Paul Albert, Vice-Dean, informed the meeting that he would chair this meeting in the Dean's absence.

Dr. Albert introduced Barbara Harris, the Dean's new secretary.

Dr. Albert asked members to please identify themselves for Barbara so that she could get to know everyone.

5. Questions and Announcements

Dr. Levy remarked on the new look of the minutes and extended his congratulations to whoever was responsible.

6. Nominations/Ratifications - Arts and Science Faculty Committees

Dr. Albert reminded members that there was a call for nominations for the elections which would take place at the next meeting of Faculty Council on May 22, 1990.

Nominations for Steering Committee's consideration should be submitted before 4:00 p.m. Thursday, May 17th.

The May 22 meeting would include approval of the graduation lists.

7. Undergraduate Curriculum Course Changes - 1991-92 (Report 67U)

90-3-3 It was moved and seconded (Leonhardt/Decarie) to accept the undergraduate curriculum course changes 1991-92.

Dr. Dicks, Vice-Dean Curriculum, briefly described all the changes in the curriculum. (Document ASFC 90-3M-B).

The following corrections in Document ASFC 90-3M-B were noted:

BIOLOGY

-Page 4; Biology 442 - typo in title, should read - Perspectives in Plant Tissue Culture and Plant Biotechnology

ETUDES

FRANCAISES

-Page 23, bottom "This new Option (Francophone Studies) will have profile of 0.00".

-Page 23; Etudes françaises - spelling errors: Option études francophones

Ce programme est destiné aux étudiant-e-s ayant une très bonne connaissance du français écrit et oral qui désirent mieux connaître la francophonie, sa diversité littéraire, linguistique et culturelle. Il intéressera tout particulièrement ceux et celles qui se destinent aux relations internationales.

-No Page 24.

ENGLISH

-Page 32; - Admission requirements for Major in Creative Writing - "... final mark of B (3.0 or better) at the previous level (of the same genre.)" Department requested the words, (3.0 or better) at the previous level of the same genre be removed. Dr. Dicks will have the university's Calendar Committee look into this.

-Page 33, ENGL 425, 426, 427 - Department requested that the descriptions stay the same as in 90-91 Calendar.

EXERCISE

SCIENCE

-Page 36; B.Sc. Hons. in Exercise Science Pre-Research Option - in Stage I, INTE 298 should read INTE 290

-Page 37; EXCI 268 should read EXCI 468

HISTORY

-Page 40; HIST 347 is being changed to a 6 credit course; therefore must have a new number. The new number is HIST 386 (6 credits.)

MODERN
LANGUAGES
& LINGUISTICS

Page 46; Modern Languages - GERM 345 - cross-listing with HIST 345 is deleted. Description to stay the same as in 1990-91 calendar.

Page 46; Sheps raised the question of the course description of GERM 345 - Modern Germany in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries. Dr. Decarie responded that this course was cross-listed presently with HIST 345. The History and Modern Languages & Linguistics Departments would consult to ensure appropriate course descriptions appear under both departments.

THEOLOGICAL
STUDIES

Page 59; - THEO 210 - description incomplete - should read "The basis and essentials of the Catholic faith: Bible, God, Creation, Jesus Christ, Holy Spirit, Church, sacraments, ultimate destiny and salvation. Specific practices and values of the Christian community. The relationship of church to society as exemplified in social reforms and liberation theology. This . . ."

Page 61; Theological Studies - Course deletions: THEO 429 Twentieth-Century Consciousness of God. Robinson questioned, "Was God now "obsolete"?"

Dr. Potworowski responded that the course was not given on a regular basis. The department found that consciousness of God is a thing that comes and goes. The department was keeping the option of offering it but as a slot course.

LIBERAL
ARTS COLLEGE

-Page 69; Rationale - point 5 should read Year III (not II).

URBAN STUDIES

-Dr. Frost mentioned that Urban Studies would now include some mapping in the programme with the cooperation of the City of Montreal.

Carried

8. Debit Cards for Concordia University Libraries (ASFC 90-3M-C)

Prof. Anne Galler, University Library Committee, sent letters to all Faculty Councils in the university asking them to request that the Senate approve university library debit cards for use in Concordia's libraries.

Dr. Albert explained to Council how the debit card system worked.

Dr. Levy wondered if the cards could be used to collect overdue fines. Ms. Appleby responded that they could not be used in this way; overdue fees were separate from the library accounts.

90-3-4 It was moved and seconded (Goodman/Potworowski) that the Arts and Science Faculty Council support the development of a debit card system for Concordia University's Libraries and that this approval be sent on to Senate.

Carried.

9. GPA Task Force Report

Dr. Albert asked for a motion to receive the GPA Task Force Report.

90-3-5 It was moved and seconded (Levy/Brian) that Arts and Science Faculty Council accept the GPA Task Force Report (ASFC 90-3M-D).

Dr. Ruby announced that the Legal Counsel's Office of the university had advised the Dean's Office that the GPA regulations could not be applied to students retroactively.

Although the implications that this had with respect to the Task Force's recommendations on the GPA was limited to some degree, this meant that anything passed at Council this afternoon would apply only to those students who entered the university as of May 1989 and not to students who were admitted to the university prior to that date.

Dr. Ruby then described how the two-tier system would operate. Students who were admitted after May of last year would come under the GPA regulations. Students who were admitted prior to May 1989 would be under the old regulations.

The GPA Task Force's recommendations would still affect a large number of students because about 2/3 of our failed students came from the first year.

Therefore, the comments of the GPA Task Force about the GPA would affect a large number of students.

Carried.

90-3-6

It was moved and seconded (Preston/Brian) that Faculty Council accept points 1A, 1B, 1C, 2B, 3A, 3B of the GPA Task Force Report.

1A: Prof. Brian pointed out that there were many new students during early registration and it was very important that departments have advisers available.

2A: Mr. Gossen questioned the inclusion of 2A and not 2B.

2A: Prof. Locke wished to know who would pay for the implementation of this recommendation, the faculty or the students.

Dr. Albert responded that 2A would be discussed later in the meeting as it had monetary implications.

1C: Dr. White commented on the difficulty a department might have demonstrating a need.

Vice-Dean Albert assured him that "need" could be discussed between the department and the Dean.

1B: Prof. Brian asked how students would be made aware of changes in course descriptions, curriculum changes, dropping courses, GPA standings, deadlines, etc.

Vice-Dean Ruby pointed out that in the past, advisors had been requested to inform students of changes and that this information could be obtained by students from a number of sources as well. It was also now to be included in the letters of admission. She pointed out that Student Affairs could only ask advisors to inform students. Many do but some do not.

Mr. Gossen noted that this item was included because some faculty members who sat on the Task Force said that they were not always informed of changes and that sometimes there was a delay of up to a year before they heard about academic changes. The committee felt that information about changes should get to advisors in a systematic way, so they would be able to inform students accordingly.

3B: Dr. White asked whether the interim measures for readmitting students

were now unnecessary, due to Legal Counsel's decision.

Vice-Dean Ruby assured him that there would still be students this year who would come under the GPA regulations and would need to be readmitted.

Carried.

90-3-7

It was moved and seconded (Sheps/Byers) that Faculty Council accept points 2A, 4A, 4B and 5A of the GPA Task Force Report.

4C: Dr. Sheps wondered why 4C was not included because the moment students were required to take the university writing test, the demand for more composition classes increased. He pointed out that the English Department was unable to offer the composition courses already in demand now because the part-time budget was not available. He further noted that these courses were largely taught by part-time instructors which created a situation where on the one hand the department was asked to increase the number of composition courses, yet on the other hand departments were constantly being asked to trim their budgets.

4C: Vice-Dean Albert noted that 4C was not included here as it involved a long-term problem and all long-term issues from the Task Force's report would be dealt with together, later. He assured Council that if there were cost implications, the Dean would be well aware of them.

Dr. Byers opened a discussion concerning the issue of adopting recommendations with cost implications. He commented on recommendations 4A, 4B, 4C; pointing out that they would have the effect of putting further pressure on first year students who would be the primary victims, when they were already trying to cope with adjusting to university life. He felt it would be unfair to hit them with such a change in the regulations which govern their lives. He noted that this recommendation would force students to take the university writing test earlier in their university careers. He also noted that the need for students to master written English up to the level required for graduation may not be uniform across the board within the Faculty of Arts and Science. It may not be as important for a mathematics student to pass the writing test before completion of 30 credits as it might be for other students. There were many foreign students in Mathematics who had great difficulty with writing but who otherwise do quite well. He pointed to the example of a foreign student who was a brilliant mathematician (A + student). The test was the very last thing he had to do and he had a great deal of difficulty with it. That student would be out of the university under this regulation.

Mr. Gossen pointed out that the recommendation was to sit the test, not pass it.

Dr. Byers then asked what would happen if the student failed.

Vice-Dean Albert reminded Council that the discussion was not about whether or not we should have a university writing test but rather about enforcing the regulation and the manner in which it should be done.

Dr. Byers then put forward a proposal to change the regulation but Dr. Albert reminded Council that the discussion was about the enforcement of the regulation which already existed. He ruled Dr. Byers' proposal out of order.

Dr. Levy assured Council that the remarks made by Sheps re the English department also applied to the French department in so far as some students who write the test in French also needed remedial French.

Mr. Gossen informed Council that one reason the Task Force wanted this regulation enforced was because first year students have a lot of problems adjusting to the new environment. The writing of the test was not an onerous task, and it identified weaknesses in many students. A failing grade in the test would identify early what problems students had and would allow them to try to correct these over the next two or three years instead of waiting to the end before realizing that they could have done so much better at university if they had a better command of English.

Prof. Locke felt that identifying problems at the beginning could save on remedial help later on because if a specific problem was identified then remedial help could be given right away. Having students sit the writing test within the first 30 credits would make it a more positive process.

Mr. Regimbald asked for clarification on whether it was to be 30 credits into a 90-credit program or 30 credits into the extended-credit program.

Mr. Gossen explained that 30 credits was chosen as regulation 16.211 now states that it should be within the first year which seemed somewhat unfair to part-time students. The new wording would apply to everyone in the same way; to take it as soon as possible without prejudicing part-timers.

Dr. Shapiro referred to the remark about costs of these programs and felt that we continue to pass resolutions with cost implications and pretend that they don't have costs attached. He cautioned that in the end the costs eventually

escalate and none of these recommendations would be implemented appropriately because the Dean would simply not have the money to assign the people to do the tasks required. He also noted his discomfort about the fact that the English Department and the French Department would have to offer more courses, course remissions will have to be granted for advisors and costs would spiral. In the end we would also cover the \$30.00 per student to implement the guidance programs. He urged that priorities be set so that the Dean would not do so arbitrarily and we would be left when the money ran out with programs which do not fulfill the functions that they were designed to do.

Dr. Perigoe questioned the appropriateness of proposing an amendment or a rider to that effect.

Prof. Shulman stressed the importance of the English and French composition course requirement and an earlier or even pre-admittance language test. He questioned, however, the feasibility of implementing these changes considering the existing part-time budget constraints.

Vice-Dean Albert cautioned that it was not necessarily true to assume that costs would come out of existing part-time budgets. He pointed out that if we were dealing with a situation that was created at the present time that would need more funding to resolve in the future there was nothing to prevent the Dean from requesting additional funding to cover these specific needs.

Dr. Byers' assessment of the university situation at the present time was that we were going in exactly the opposite direction. He pointed out that the part-time budget was under much pressure. As Chair of Mathematics he wished to state that students in the sciences had a great deal of problems with numeracy illiteracy that we might someday want to address. This will be a costly undertaking and to pass it hoping that the Dean might be able to convince the Vice-Rector to give more money to the faculty did not strike him as the correct thing to do.

Dr. Dicks believed that there were some technical or logistical problems perhaps in implementing the sanction part of this recommendation but noted that it was not even clear that there would be greater demands on part-time budgets. He noted that the university writing test and composition interact and pointed out the alternatives. According to the rules, students were urged to take the test during their first term and it was quite likely that a majority of people urged and even compelled to take it in the first term will pass it and would be done hence there would be no need for them to take composition. He suggested that a couple of technical studies before

implementation might well prove useful as these were long term measures which could not be implemented immediately in any case.

Prof. Brian requested that "be required" should be replaced with "strongly urged" as there were extenuating circumstances. She wanted to see advisors urge students to take it as early as possible, but that students should not be placed in a position where if they had not done it by 30 credits they were not going to be able to continue.

Dr. Decarie argued that our students did not have a literacy problem and it was absurd to debate this. If the bulk of the students who failed the writing test were in fact, passing their courses, why on earth were we fussing about a literacy problem. It seemed to him that if there was a problem it was not with the students, it was with the courses. The student who had difficulty understanding and writing, had a problem which developed out of 13 years of neglect and it was encouraged by three more years of neglect at university. The evidence that illiterates were passing courses was certainly proof of that. The notion that those years of neglect could somehow be made up with one or two English courses, however well taught, was absolutely absurd. He suggested that if the problem was to be addressed, this nonsense of thinking that educational problems may be sent to a specialist for a quick fix had to stop and the problem addressed in every classroom.

90-3-8 An amendment to 4C was moved and seconded (Decarie/Dicks) that Council recommends the investigation of means of improving the teaching of writing in all courses.

Mr. Gossen stated that writing of the test was not such an onerous task that people with heavy workloads would not be able to do it. Decarie's amendment seemed to be getting away from what we tried to do here, which was to be specific. He agreed that 13 years of neglect could not be corrected in 1 year of university but the amendment was too vague and would result in nothing being done. There would not be any practical result whereas this recommendation at least, had a tangibility to it.

Professor Locke thought that foreign students coming to Concordia had to write a TOEFL test before they came which would give some indication of where they were in terms of writing and reading. Taking the University Writing Test would give them a second indicator. She could not understand how we could stress writing in all courses without introducing papers where they simply did not exist.

Dr. Shapiro noted that this was not the place to discuss this, nor should the university writing test really be discussed under the rubric of the GPA. He acknowledged that there was a tenuous connection between performance on the university writing test and the problem under consideration here particularly given the fact that many students fail, certainly in Economics because they were not numerically inclined. He suggested that the best course of action would be to leave all of section 4A, 4B and 4C and not discuss them at all as they were not relevant to this discussion.

Dr. McQueen advised Council that in Engineering they certainly had the experience that writing tests and writing courses were very useful. He pointed out that the proposed amendment would be absolutely impossible in Engineering. He noted that in Arts or Social Science people used English much more as a means of cross-ideas whereas in Engineering Mathematics was used more and professors tended to concentrate on the technical aspects and were swayed by the idea that if the student knew the technical content they were not going to fail him because he did not know English.

Prof. Preston pointed out that the amendment obscured the issue and items under discussion. It made a big shift in responsibility and deserved our attention. She wondered if the idea of separating it from the motion on hand could be entertained and suggested it be proposed as a separate motion under 6B - the section of long-term issues.

90-3-9

It was moved and seconded (Decarie/Dicks) that the amendment be withdrawn.

Dr. Byers expressed confusion on the question of how 4A, 4B and 4C were related to the GPA and wished to have the connection explained.

Prof. Locke explained that the Task Force felt that there were students who were having problems in writing which showed up in their papers for certain courses. Although they knew the course content, they could not express themselves in writing. This problem could be identified early if students wrote the test within the first 30 credits and remedial action advised early in their university career and not after a series of failures.

Dr. Gray wished to raise the point that persons failing in his courses were not necessarily persons who spoke or wrote poor French or English but persons who missed the point entirely.

Ms. Budick noted that International students who wrote the TOEFL before coming were exempted from writing the University Writing Test.

Mr. Goodman as a member of the University Writing Test Committee supported the idea that writing problems should be addressed early in a student's career. He felt that the idea of teaching literacy was very important and should be supported when the motion comes up. He noted that problems in competency should be recognized. It was not simply a writing test, it was a marker on the road that should help us see the effects farther along.

Professor Sheps thought that the GPA was used to solve too many things. It was regarded as a crude indicator that was looked upon as a standard in order to raise standards in the faculty generally which meant that it should not also be used as a diagnostic tool. Part of the problem was that people were trying to use it as a diagnostic tool and have assumed that the major reason students do not do well was because they wrote badly but, he noted that was only one of the reasons. He noted that his earlier comment on the pressure on composition was not made lightly nor as the Acting Chair of the English Department to suddenly double or triple the number of composition courses; it was simply that many students who fail the University Writing Test felt they should take a composition course. Inevitably, the demand increased. Another problem was that composition courses were extremely effective in improving writing but could not do the whole job. Wherever it was possible or reasonable to have writing components in a course then the professor should be encouraged to take that seriously. The question of whether or not the university had a writing policy should be answered. There were exhortations to address all kinds of issues but very rarely does the cost factor weigh. When resolutions were passed agreeing to do everything all at once the result can often be that everything is done on a shoestring, and done badly. There was nothing wrong with choosing goals that could actually be realized financially, at every level and in all kinds of discussions. He cautioned against trying to compress a number of issues into one single question which was what he felt was being done in this instance.

Mr. Gossen argued that two-thirds of failures occur in the first year and no doubt they occur for a variety of reasons. Although they could not all be addressed in this particular recommendation at least one of them was being addressed and that was why it was included.

Dr. Shapiro felt that this was precisely why it should not be there. He pointed out that even if it were assumed that there was a link between writing and the GPA (which he did not accept) by the time a student took the writing test and a writing deficiency was discovered, the student would have flunked out anyway by this time. He further stated that by the time students took that remedial English course to make up for it, assuming they were on conditional standing, they would not have the time to make it up. This whole discussion

was therefore entirely superfluous. Although he was perfectly sympathetic to the notion that we had to raise our ranking standards he suggested that it should be discussed under the topic - general education quality. It had nothing to do with GPA.

Mr. Gossen was surprised that reading and writing had nothing to do with the GPA which he pointed out was like saying they had nothing to do with marks.

Dr. Byers noted his understanding of the thinking that went behind these resolutions and it seemed to him that there was an assumption that we can mitigate some of the problems that we perceive arising from the implication of this new GPA regulation. This seems to be based on certain peoples' experience. It was certainly not going to be the primary problem in the science-based area of the Arts and Science Faculty. Nevertheless, he thought that remedial work was a major problem worth spending some time on and objected to its inclusion in this set of regulations. He felt that an important problem could end up being dealt with in this very minor way. He pointed out that we had gone away from a potential major problem for this university, and our faculty in particular, by moving into a discussion of it. He signalled his intention to vote against it and hoped that it would come back to Council in a more productive way.

Dr. Decarie described the problem as he saw it. Council had approved a hopelessly artificial means of raising our standards and had done it in the very comfortable way - by putting the burden on the students and assuming there was nothing wrong with the faculty. He pointed out he had sat in Council for four years and heard an endless stream of suggestions to raise standards by putting more hurdles in front of the students. As educators he felt that there was a moral responsibility to make some attempt to help the students get over the hurdles. He did not think that this kind of thing was the answer but he knew it was the only answer this group was likely to come up with. Since he could not imagine Council deciding that there was something wrong with the teaching he felt that the least that could be done was to put something in here to help the students.

90-3-10 It was moved and seconded (Widden/Gray) that 5A be voted separately from 4A, 4B and 4C.

9-3-7 19 for; 5 against; 7 abstentions.

Carried.

- 90-3-11 It was moved and seconded (Gossen/Decarie) that Recommendation 2A(i) of the GPA Task Force Report (the retention program and failed student program) be made available.

Carried.

- 90-3-12 It was moved and seconded (Gossen/Levy), Recommendation 2A(ii) of the GPA Task Force Report, that the Faculty of Arts and Science cover the cost of these programs for Arts and Science students using the program, estimated at \$30 per student.

Dr. Decarie suggested that if a student failed and wanted a chance to return, it was not unreasonable for the student to pay the \$30. The money should not be diverted from other more pressing demands.

Ms. McLachlan wondered whether the burden could be shared by students and the Faculty.

Dr. Perigoe asked whether this would be for every student or only students who required the program.

Mr. Gossen noted that the Task Force recommendation was that the Faculty pay, not Guidance Services as these were Arts and Science students. The \$30 per student was Guidance Services' estimate per Arts and Science student taking the program.

Dr. Ruby informed Council that Guidance had put a limit on this - they did not have personnel available to do any more than 250 students.

Professor Brian wanted to know on what basis we would limit students.

Mr. Gossen stated that he would rather see a cost-sharing clause put in than a cap on numbers.

Dr. Ruby suggested that both were needed. She noted that even if we would like to make it available to every student needing the program, Guidance did not have the personnel available.

Dr. Shapiro enquired whether the \$30 per student was with a cap of 250 students. He also asked whether Guidance would have to augment their facilities in any way or hire new guidance counsellors.

Dr. Ruby informed Council that Guidance were prepared to bring in people that they had available on a part-time basis, but were not prepared to see more than 250 students.

Dr. Byers suggested that if we were going to pass things like GPA regulations, then he was in favour of helping Vice-Dean Ruby's office to deal with the problems of GPA regulations.

Dr. Ruby calculated that in terms of budget, the figures would be 250 students times \$30, or \$7,500 maximum.

Dr. Shapiro expressed concern that more than 250 students might request the service and the cost to Arts and Science would then be more than \$7500.

Dr. Ruby doubted that the figure would even be 250 because many failed students did not want to continue and chose other options. She felt that the number of students wanting the service would be about 200.

Dr. Decarie pointed out that the sum of \$7500 was not very large, however, the difficulty was that this university and others have gone increasingly into the business of preparing people for university which it should not be doing.

Dr. Valaskakis felt that the service should be offered; the issue was who should pay - the university, the faculty or the student.

Dr. McQueen noted that the amount of money being discussed was rather small if compared to the amount it would cost the faculty to try and figure out who can get back in and who had to stay out. Although he agreed that there was that cost, the Faculty of Engineering were very happy with the grade point average system. Now there were very few failures among students in their final year and they had a core of students with really good marks right through the program. The cost of getting rid of the poor students and also helping those who had problems but were basically sound and getting them back in again, was worth it.

Dr. Levy wanted to know what happened to students who were not in the Faculty of Arts and Science as the GPA referred to the whole university. What happened to students who were in Commerce.

Mr. Goodman stated that \$7500 to take care of the symptoms now and treat the disease later was a small price to pay within the entire budget.

Dr. Gavin cautioned against mixing the finances with the question of program.

What kind of a counselling program can we offer for \$30. The financial issue was a separate one.

Prof. Brian pointed out that the Faculty of Fine Arts did not subscribe to a GPA average or set of regulations. She noted that our GPA regulations differ slightly from those of Commerce and Engineering. The most significant difference between Arts and Science and Commerce and Engineering was the much higher entrance requirements which they required of their students. They were already working with students who were at a higher level and less likely to be affected.

Dr. Sharma questioned if whether it would take two years to get through to the Senate.

Mr. Gossen assured Council that the Task Force asked Guidance what they could provide and the 250 students cap would apply to students from this faculty only.

He also stated that with respect to the program, the Task Force felt itself unable to assess a counselling program and that this was something Guidance Services was competent to do. Their estimate was \$30.

Professor Locke pointed out that the program offered by Guidance had two cores: a) for students to identify their needs and goals; b) a learning skills program. She noted that it was structured by Guidance, people we trust to provide a program for students already and the \$30 per student was only to provide additional staff. Guidance were quite secure that this additional staff could provide the type of quality program which was already being offered by them.

90-3-12 20 for, 10 against, 3 abstentions

Carried.

Dr. Albert informed Council that with respect to 5C, Steering Committee suggested that Vice-Dean Ruby discuss this with the Registrar's Office.

Dr. Ruby assured Council that students could take a course over again if they wished but not for credit if it has already been passed.

Dr. Albert asked for a motion to approve 1D of the GPA Task Force Report. No motion was forthcoming.

90-3-13 It was moved and seconded (Levy Gossen) to accept 2C, 5B and 6A of the GPA Task Force Report.

Dr. Byers proposed an amendment to incorporate the request for a general report within two years on the implication of the GPA, with particular reference to the 2C, 5B and 6A. He also wanted to see a global statement on questions which might come up needing to be addressed but which were not mentioned specifically.

Dr. Albert assured Council that if the discussion showed that it was interested in receiving a report of these analyses after two years that one will be made.

Dr. Shapiro wished to know who would make it.

Dr. Ruby stated that her office would be responsible and added that they had already begun it.

Dr. Dicks also pointed out that the Registrar's Office would also be involved. He further noted that the Dean could commissions such reports.

Dr. Ruby told Council that she had spoken to Guidance Services about having the effectiveness of the Retention and Failed Student Programs assessed after two years and a report as to what the success rate was re 5B (monitoring). She noted her discomfort with 6A, as she found it disturbing to have particular populations of student bodies singled out rather than looking at the situation in terms of all students.

Dr. Albert added that the list of identifiable groups was purely that - a suggested list. He presumed that the Student Affairs Office would have the freedom to look in more detail at any group it liked which might be affected by this.

Mr. Gossen wished to know if Council was considering the proposal that this report be more general.

Dr. Albert assured him that the discussion was not about how the report will look, but about studying the effects of the implementing the GPA rule.

Mr. Gossen further queried if the motion should specify who would make the report as 6A only specified that it would come from the Dean's Office. The other two did not.

Dr. Albert clarified that the report would come out of the Dean's Office via the Student Affairs Office.

90-3-13 **Vote: 22 for; 2 against; 2 abstentions.**

Carried.

Dr. Albert suggested that as 5C needed to be discussed further between Dr. Ruby and the Registrar's Office it should be deferred and brought back to Council when more information was obtained from the Registrar's Office.

Mr. Gossen noted that the concern of the Task Force was that students should not be able to raise their GPA by taking an easy course which they had taken before.

Dr. Decarie read page 4 of the text of the report which stated: "Students are presently permitted to repeat courses for which they have already received credit in order to upgrade their A.W.G.P.A., though not for additional credit (see 16.3.9, Paragraph 3 of the 1990-91 Concordia University Calendar),." and asked for confirmation that this was correct.

Dr. Ruby agreed that it would be included in the A.W.G.P.A., but as a second entry.

Mr. Gossen felt that if this were so he would want the item to remain as part of the report.

Dr. Albert ruled that this motion should be considered at our next meeting. He pointed out that Steering Committee felt we should have more information on this particular recommendation from Registrar's Office.

90-3-14 **It was moved and seconded (Byers/Valaskakis) that Recommendation 5C of the GPA Task Force Report be tabled.**

Carried.

90-3-15 **It was moved and seconded (Decarie/Goodman) that Council recommend investigation of the means of improving the teaching of writing in all**

appropriate courses.

Dr. Decarie stated that he was prompted to introduce this motion because of recommendation 3; and the recognition of the need for preparation to meet some of the damage that would be caused by the GPA which would recognize that students and faculty shared the blame for the failing of students. He suggested that as we addressed the problems that arose from this GPA, we must to some degree look at ourselves in looking for solutions.

Dr. Levy stated that when speaking of appropriate courses, a requirement of writing does not apply only to courses, it applied afterward. He wondered about the validity of this.

Dr. Decarie pointed out that a student had to learn a means of writing, appropriate to his own discipline as they were all quite different. The word appropriate being deliberate - he wished to have the notion planted that some of this was our fault and our responsibility.

Prof. Brian asked whether this was a motion to do away with the University Writing Test?

Dr. Decarie denied this.

Dr. Widden felt that many of the problems which had been discussed today were not directly associated with the GPA. His feeling was that this Council at some point had to come to grips with the great problem of students coming to university unprepared. He wondered whether the time had come to put pressure on the system that was bringing the students to us. Although he allowed that we may also be failing in our job, he felt that at some point all the universities in Quebec had to start pressuring the system.

Prof. Brian as Director of the Centre for Mature Students wished to disassociate herself from this statement pointing out that the whole point of the Centre was as a mechanism whereby students who did not have normal university entrance requirements could be brought into the university. She had no wish to go on record as supporting standardized entrance requirements.

90-3-15

Vote: 21 for; 0 against; 2 abstentions.

Carried.

10. **Other Business**

Dr. Sharma wished to point out that the Physics Department sent three unanimous motions to Steering Committee. Two were sent directly to the Task Force. The third was discussed here, tabled and sent to the Task Force. They did not address any one of those motions.

Dr. Albert undertook to transmit these comments to Steering Committee.

Dr. Albert noted that he was remiss in not thanking the members of the Task Force on behalf of Dean Bertrand and wished to do so now.

Dr. Ruby stated that there seemed to be a number of Chairs present this afternoon and asked that grades be handed in as Ray Martin's office reported that there were still 20% of potential graduating marks in Arts and Science outstanding.

11. **Time and Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting will be held May 22nd at 9:30 a.m. in DL-200. The Graduation Lists are to be approved and representatives elected to the various committees. We will also deal with two new graduate programs which should receive initial approval from Council before making their way to Quebec later this year.

12. **Adjournment**

90-3-16 It was moved and seconded (Goodman/Potworowski) that the meeting be adjourned at 4:32 p.m.

10. Other Business

Dr. Sharma wished to point out that the Physics Department sent three unanimous motions to Steering Committee. Two were sent directly to the Task Force. The third was discussed here, tabled and sent to the Task Force. They did not address any one of those motions.

Dr. Albert undertook to transmit these comments to Steering Committee.

Dr. Albert noted that he was remiss in not thanking the members of the Task Force on behalf of Dean Bertrand and wished to do so now.

Dr. Ruby stated that there seemed to be a number of Chairs present this afternoon and asked that grades be handed in as Ray Martin's office reported that there were still 20% of potential graduating marks in Arts and Science outstanding.

11. Time and Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held May 22nd at 9:30 a.m. in DL-200. The Graduation Lists are to be approved and representatives elected to the various committees. We will also deal with two new graduate programs which should receive initial approval from Council before making their way to Quebec later this year.

12. Adjournment

90-3-16 It was moved and seconded (Goodman/Potworowski) that the meeting be adjourned at 4:32 p.m.